# Commentary to support marking

Physics Sample A

SL & HL Internal Assessment May 2016

English

In the table below please provide a **short** commentary, maximum of 60 words per question/criteria, to justify the mark allocation to support workshop leaders using this sample in a workshop. Please do not refer to the candidate by name or number, or make comparison to other candidates as this document will need to be anonymised before uploading on the Workshop leader resource centre (WRC).

The commentaries are intended to support teachers’ understanding of assessment in this subject so that they can then develop other activities that assess understanding to the same standard.

Guidance for writing commentaries:

* Before writing comments read the subject report and grade descriptors for this subject. Comment should not contradict either of the documents.
* Explain why students missed/gained marks and the level of understanding that this demonstrated; useful language from the grade descriptors could be included.
* Highlight any common problems that need to be addressed by teachers

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Mark** | **Out of** | **Justification** |
| **Personal**  **Engagement** | **2** | **2** | The topic is of genuine interest to the student and they demonstrate serious thought about a rather basic investigation. There is some innovation and attention to detail all supporting full marks under personal engagement. |
| **Exploration** | **4** | **6** | Although this is a basic and obvious RQ the student presents the exploration in a serious and thoughtful way. The theory is appropriate as is the well-defined methodology. The factors affecting outcome have been considered but there is some confusion over variables. EX is on the 4 to 5 level, and using the best-fit method it is awarded a strong 4. |
| **Analysis** | **4** | **6** | The data is relevant and processing is basic but accurate. Uncertainties are recognized in calculations but not correctly on the graphs, and their significance is not fully considered. Analysis is on the 4-5 lines but the best-fit method gives analysis a solid 4 mark. |
| **Evaluation** | **3** | **6** | The conclusion is consistent with the research question expectations. There is little discussion or justification, however. There is no consideration of varying drag forces and its possible effect. Few limitations are considered and there is no suggestion of an extension; improvements are simply. A weak 3 is awarded to evaluation. |
| **Communications** | **3** | **4** | The text is clear and focused most of the time. Some details or clarification are missing or not explained well; there are mistakes in units and some vocabulary but overall communications is assessed in the 3-4 mark band. |
| **Total:** | **16** | **24** |  |